

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE


In re Patent Application of

NIKANDER

Serial No. 10/091,288

Filed: March 6, 2002

For: ADDRESS MECHANISMS IN INTERNET PROTOCOL



Atty. Ref.: 3772-8

Group: 2142

Examiner: Hollar, A.

\* \* \* \* \*

Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

**ELECTION UNDER 35 USC §121**

In response to the Office Action dated May 16, 2005 holding the subject matter of claims 1-11 and 17-20; claims 12-15 and 21; claim 16; and claim 22 to be non-obvious and patentably distinct from that of each other. Applicant(s) hereby elect the invention of Group I, (upon which claims 1-11 and 17-20 are readable) for further substantive examination.

This election is made without traverse. However, since a restriction requirement is never proper unless the restricted group of claims is patentably distinct (i.e., inter alia, non-obvious under 35 USC §103) from the elected group of claims, the Examiner is requested to insure that such patentable distinctness is present before proceeding to make the requirement final.

It is respectfully requested that the non-elected claims be retained for use with a possible divisional application.

Respectfully submitted,  
NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

June 16, 2005

By: 

H. Warren Burnam, Jr.

Reg. No. 29,366

HWB:lsb  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100